

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on January 26, 2005, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-51 were pending in this Application. Claims 52 and 53 have been added. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by new claims 52 and 53. Claims 1-53 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 23, 25, 27, 33, 39, 41, 43, 46, 49, 52 and 53 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9, 11-20, and 22-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,574,630 to Augustine et al. (hereinafter Augustine) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,448 to Hemphill et al. (hereinafter Hemphill).

The Examiner stated that Augustine is silent regarding the "receiving identification information that identifies an executable resource capable of processing the event" language contained in claim 1. The Examiner cited Hemphill as disclosing the "receiving identification information that identifies an executable resource capable of processing the event" language. Specifically, the Examiner stated that Hemphill discloses the same at column 10, lines 1-25. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement regarding Hemphill. A careful review of Hemphill discloses an Error Notification Message (ENM) which includes a header regarding the type of packet sent on a network, a definitions section for describing the host, and an ENM document including more specific information about the managed device and the management event. The ENM document includes an identifier for the managed device, an event specific section, executable code or scripting language for execution by the event processor logic of the management server and a file locator for locating an information file about the management event. Hemphill (as well as Augustine) disclose providing notification of an event but fail to disclose or suggest

identification information that identifies an executable resource capable of processing the event.

In contrast to Augustine and Hemphill, claim 1 recites "receiving identification information that identifies an executable resource capable of processing the event". This is disclosed throughout the specification as filed, for example at page 6, line 2 through page 7, line 25. A specific example of the identification information that identifies an executable resource can be found beginning at page 6, lines 25-28 which recites:

In a further embodiment, the executable resource accesses a database including notification preferences of a user. Thus, the user can indicate one or more devices (e.g. a pager) that he/she wishes to use to receive a notification.

Thus, claim 1 includes information relating to an executable resource for processing event information, not mere notification of an event as disclosed by Augustine and Hemphill. Accordingly, since claim 1 discloses receiving identification information that identifies an executable resource capable of processing the event while Augustine and Hemphill, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the same, claim 1 is believed allowable over Augustine and Hemphill. Independent claims 12, 23, 25, 27, 33, 39, 41, 43, 46, and 49 contain similar language as claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Claims 2-9, 11, 13-20, 22, 24, 26, 28-31, 34-38, 40, 42, 44-45, 47-48 and 50-51 depend from claims 1, 12, 23, 25, 27, 33, 39, 41, 43, 46 or 49 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-9, 11-20, and 22-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Augustine in view of Hemphill is believed to have been overcome.

Claims 10 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Augustine and Hemphill and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 6,496,568 to Nelson (hereinafter Nelson). Claims 10 and 21 depend from claims 1 or 12 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 10

-17-

and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Augustine and Hemphill and further in view of Nelson is believed to have been overcome.

In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome placing claims 1-53 in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

If the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office deems a fee necessary, this fee may be charged to the account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 366-9600, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 40,150
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 366-9600
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805
Customer No.: 022468

Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-2414

Dated: April 19, 2005